



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,249	03/17/2004	Ralf Mauritz	WP21718US	5270
23690	7590	09/28/2006	EXAMINER	
Roche Diagnostics Corporation, Inc. 9115 Hague Road PO Box 50457 Indianapolis, IN 46250-0457			TRAN, MY CHAU T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1639	

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/802,249

Applicant(s)

MAURITZ ET AL.

Examiner

MY-CHAU T. TRAN

Art Unit

1639

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-22, drawn to a quality control method, classified in class 436, subclass 164.
  - II. Claims 23, 25, and 26, drawn to a nucleic acid synthesis building block, classified in class 536, subclass 6.1.
  - III. Claim 24, drawn to a method for the production of a nucleic acid array, classified in class 435, subclass DIG 40.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions of Group II (product) and Group I and III (process of use) are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product such as split-pool synthesis for making a library of nucleic acid.

3. Inventions of Group I and Group III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different

Art Unit: 1639

inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation and effects, i.e. using different steps, requiring different reagents and/or producing different results. For example, Group I requires the method step of carrying out a determination of the detectable protecting groups on the array after cleavage in order to determine the efficacy of deprotection. Group II requires the method step of carrying out a determination of the detectable protecting groups on the array after cleavage. These steps require different reagents and/or producing different results. As a result, the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation and effects, and the restriction between these groups is proper.

4. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and/or divergent subject matter. The different methods would require completely different searches in both the patent and non-patent databases, and there is no expectation that the searches would be coextensive. Therefore, this does create an undue search burden, and restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected

Art Unit: 1639

process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

6. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: of the claimed invention for Groups I-III. Election is required as follows.

7. If applicant elects the invention of Group I, applicant is required to elect from the following patentably distinct species. Claim 1 is generic.

Subgroup A: Species of a plurality of different biopolymers (e.g., see claims 1 and 12-22)

Art Unit: 1639

Applicant is required to elect, for search purposes, a *single specific* plurality of different biopolymers. The election should result in a *particularly defined* core structure that is shared by all the members of the plurality of different biopolymers. In defining this core structure, all variable groups should be defined (i.e. all atoms and bonds shown) as much as possible.

Subgroup B: Species of detectable protecting groups (e.g., see claims 2-11)

Applicant is required to elect, for search purposes, a *single specific* detectable protecting group.

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting materials from which they are made. Moreover, the above species can be separately classified. Consequently, the species have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter. Therefore, this does create an undue search burden, and election for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species of the above species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

8. If applicant elects the invention of Group II, applicant is required to elect from the following patentably distinct species. Claim 23 is generic.

Subgroup A: Species of a nucleic acid synthesis building block (e.g., see claim 23)

Art Unit: 1639

Applicant is required to elect, for search purposes, a *single specific* nucleic acid synthesis building block. The election should result in a *particularly defined* core structure that is shared by all the members of the nucleic acid synthesis building block. In defining this core structure, all variable groups should be defined (i.e. all atoms and bonds shown) as much as possible.

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting materials from which they are made. Moreover, the above species can be separately classified. Consequently, the species have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter. Therefore, this does create an undue search burden, and election for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species of the above species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

9. If applicant elects the invention of Group III, applicant is required to elect from the following patentably distinct species. Claim 24 is generic.

Subgroup A: Species of a plurality of different biopolymers (e.g., see claim 24)

Applicant is required to elect, for search purposes, a *single specific* plurality of different biopolymers. The election should result in a *particularly defined* core structure that is shared by all the members of the plurality of different biopolymers. In defining this

Art Unit: 1639

core structure, all variable groups should be defined (i.e. all atoms and bonds shown) as much as possible.

Subgroup B: Species of detectable protecting groups (e.g., see claim 24)

Applicant is required to elect, for search purposes, a *single specific* detectable protecting group.

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting materials from which they are made. Moreover, the above species can be separately classified. Consequently, the species have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter. Therefore, this does create an undue search burden, and election for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species of the above species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

1. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement *must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added.* An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered *nonresponsive* unless accompanied by an election.
2. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an



Art Unit: 1639

allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, *applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.* MPEP § 809.02(a).

3. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention. Because the above restriction/election requirement is complex, a telephone call to applicants to request an oral election was not made. See MPEP § 812.01.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

### ***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to My-Chau T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-272-0810.

Art Unit: 1639

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday: 8:00-2:30; Tuesday-Thursday: 7:30-5:00;  
Friday: 8:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Paras, Jr., can be reached on 571-272-4517. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

My-Chau T. Tran   
Patent Examiner  
September 21, 2006